

for staying in Vietnam. Our objectives are emphasized that our contribution can best be only on the periphery, and that basically and primarily the solution must be sought by the Vietnamese themselves. That solution involves not only a military victory over the Vietcong in South Vietnam, but stopping the flow of arms from North Vietnam, the rectification of border difficulties with Cambodia and possibly Laos, and perhaps, most important of all, a government based on stability and support of the Vietnamese people.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 more minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At the present time, according to the best information I have received—and I have a purpose in making this statement—this Government has indicated an interest in the four-power proposal advanced by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Chief of State of Cambodia, to the effect that a four-power conference should be convened for the purpose of guaranteeing the borders and the neutrality of Cambodia—those powers to be Thailand, South Vietnam, the United States, and Cambodia itself.

When people try to read into remarks which I have made that I have advocated that in any negotiations of this sort vis-a-vis South Vietnam, I have indicated that Communist China must be one of the participants, they are reading into my remarks something which is not there. I tried to make the Record clear in the colloquy I had with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the other day.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the first place, I am sorry the Senator from Montana did not hear what I said. I only referred to him as showing my continuity of interest in the area. I did not in any way try to go over the same ground again.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But it was the same subject.

Mr. JAVITS. It was the same subject. Second, I am certainly not one who has felt that the Senator from Montana has in any way involved the Communist Chinese among the negotiating parties. Perhaps others have, but I certainly have not, and I make no such assertion now, and would not dream of doing so. I was very clear as to the Senator's position.

Third, I am sure the Senator heard my recommendation—and I believe we are arriving at a national consensus—that it would be well to have that policy firmly established through a declaration by the President to the people, especially as we are suffering casualties in South Vietnam, the only place in the world where we are. It is really a hot conflict at the moment. The declaration should be supported by a white paper on the part of the State Department, giving the whole history of our relationship to this crisis.

Fourth, the Senator and I really do not differ quite so much, as we have

readily shown the grounds of difference.

I am deeply concerned about a repetition of the difficulties we face in Cambodia and the Pathet Lao difficulties in Laos and South Vietnam, if we give the South Vietnamese the feeling that we are anxious to liquidate that situation at the earliest moment.

I would rather give them the feeling that we are willing to accept casualties, provided we remain true to the original mission we set for ourselves. There may be a little difference of timing, there may be a little difference in emphasis, but as we have gradually narrowed the grounds of difference, I think timing and emphasis are the points that stand out.

I fully respect what the Senator has said. No one honors him more than I for the fact that this subject has been thrust into the forefront of discussion. He and I agree that this could not be otherwise than helpful.

Finally, one of the major items to appear in the press this morning is the disarray of the NATO Alliance on this issue. It is reported that there is considerable dissension in NATO, which is all the more reason for taking advantage of a developing consensus in our Nation and nailing it down as to the fundamental basis of American policy and our willingness to take casualties and difficulties in order to persevere in that policy in South Vietnam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the American people had better become fully aware of exactly what confronts us, in view of the possibilities in Vietnam. The truth will hurt no one. The truth should and must be told. If we go along on the basis of some policies which I have heard advocated, even in the Senate, and also in the press, the American people had better be made fully aware of the costs involved, not only in material and money, but in men, as well. And they had better think this through carefully. All we here can do is discuss this matter. The responsibility lies with the President of the United States. I think he has conducted himself in exemplary fashion. His understanding is sound, and his grip has been firm; and I only hope that when Mr. McNamara returns from Vietnam—and I, for one, am delighted that a man of his caliber is going there again—he will be able to give the President the benefit of his survey and inquiry, so that we shall be in a better position to determine where we are, and where we are going.

The Senator from New York has mentioned the fact that NATO is in disarray. Mr. President, NATO has been in disarray for years; CENTO has been in disarray; and SEATO has been in disarray. I think the best thing our country can do is reassess its foreign policy, insofar as it is possible to do so, face up to the realities of today, and not depend so much on the wishes of yesterday.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield again to me, very briefly?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the American people will accept the risks in Vietnam, if we pursue our present policy. That is

the fundamental point I am trying to make—that they are not unduly dissuaded from that by the desires on which both the Senator from Montana and I agree. I believe that when the issue is presented squarely—and it seems to me the Senator from Montana and I certainly agree on that—the American people will accept the risks and will back a continuance of the present policy, notwithstanding the risks, even including casualties.

UNITED STATES CHECKS LARD DEAL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to commend the prompt action of President Johnson in blocking shipments of lard from the United States to Communist Cuba. By acting promptly, the President prevented a small hole in the dike of U.S. economic policy from becoming an even more disastrous breakthrough which would have given all of our European allies even more of an invitation to trade with Castro.

Mr. President, the incident shows that there is a pressing need for closer coordination of trade policies. Within the United States, and under the terms of the Export Control Act of 1949, there is adequate authority to regulate exports, to require licenses, and, if necessary, to refuse licenses in cases where trade would not be in the overall interests of the United States. Yet trade with Cuba has been treated in such an amorphous manner, without form or consistency, that it is technically possible for U.S. merchants to sell many types of food and medicine to Cuba, without any kind of license. Even though such sales would have great foreign policy effects, there is at present no requirement for licensing. The first step surely is for the United States to set its own house in order, and to require in the case of Cuba, as we do for Red China, North Vietnam, and North Korea, that export licenses be obtained for all shipments. In this way our Government could grant permission for items badly needed for humanitarian purposes, such as perhaps certain kinds of drugs in an emergency, but could refuse licenses in a case of this sort, where the motive is primarily profit and the impact would have been disastrous.

The second step in United States economic coordination of trade with Cuba, after we have set our own procedures in somewhat better order, is to press our allies more effectively for a coordinated policy on Cuban trade. The cutting off of aid, small as it was, might have been extremely effective, had it been done promptly after the missile crisis in 1962. It will obviously mean a good deal less today. We should plan for an international conference of all the major industrial nations involved, with a view to working out fair and reasonable procedures on the Cuba trade. We may have to make compromises of other kinds, to get their agreement on Cuba. We may, for instance, have to yield to British pleas to cut off United States aid to Indonesia—a course which many Americans would in any case favor; but we

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3943

should make clear that cooperation is a two-way street, and that if our allies are going to expect to obtain our cooperation on issues of major importance to them, we should have their cooperation in connection with matters which we consider important. An international conference of major Western industrial nations and Japan would be the best way to make clear our own determination to do everything within our power to insure that the economic strength and resources of the West are not available to Castro in his continuing campaign for the subversion of Latin America.

BULGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Tuesday, March 3, is the anniversary of Bulgarian Independence Day. Near the end of the last century, the breakup of the Ottoman Empire released the captive peoples of Slavic Europe. Centuries before, the Bulgarian Nation had been a great nation under vigorous and progressive kings. The Bulgarians remembered this, and were determined to have their freedom. After bitter fighting, they gained independence for a ravaged and chaotic country; and by 1912 the dedicated leadership of the liberal parties established Bulgaria as a firm and developing nation. Then tragic wars damaged much of the great work done in education, construction, and industry.

Throughout the interwar years, Bulgaria attempted to repair the injury done between 1912 and 1918. By 1939, conditions were once again markedly good. Bulgaria was on the point of entering a period of very rapid development. One reason for its growth was new trade with other countries, especially Germany. This led Bulgaria to the sad mistake of declaring war against the Western Allies, along with Germany, in 1941. That was real and tragic evidence that trade brings political influence. That action is a lesson which many nations today should heed. Again war brought Bulgaria suffering and destruction. In 1944, Bulgaria began trying to escape from German control, and offered to sign an armistice with England and the United States. But Soviet Russia was closer than we were; and in September 1944, Soviet troops invaded Bulgaria. With their coming, as everywhere in Europe, arrived the Communist Party and its heartless oppression. The patriots of Bulgaria had been fighting valiantly against both German and Soviet occupation. But the Communist Party, backed by the presence of the Red army, seized all power early in 1945. Then the familiar story of executions, deportations, concentration camps, and rigged elections was repeated all over again. By the end of 1945, another country had been forced into the Communist bloc of satellite subjects.

The Bulgarian people were victims of foreign domination for centuries. Yet they never gave up hope, because there ideas and examples of a better life were flowing to them from free countries elsewhere in the world. It was these ideas and examples which inspired the original Bulgarian independence which we celebrate today.

We are confident that under the hopeless and pointless subjugation now exercised over Bulgaria by the Soviet Union, the spark of freedom burns as bright as ever. The Communists' efforts are directed at convincing the Bulgarians that there is no life better than communism. Our task is to prove to them that there is a much better life in freedom. Especially we must congratulate Bulgarian-Americans for their efforts on behalf of their homeland. May they soon celebrate with renewed joy an independence day which will have increased meaning.

NASA ELECTRONICS RESEARCH CENTER—LET US REEXAMINE SUCH DECISIONS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, over 100 communities across the Nation requested consideration for the location of the proposed \$60 million NASA Electronics Research Center. Apart from the initial investment of \$60 million in building it, this facility will cause as much as \$50 million a year to go into the local economy and benefit people living in that entire area. In addition, it will have significant long-range value in attracting new industry to the area in which it is located.

When plans for this project were first announced, it was rumored that it was earmarked for Boston. NASA officials dutifully heard appeals by university administrators, scientists, and local officials from 29 locations throughout our Nation, including several in Ohio, seeking this research Center. Then they announced that the Center would go to Boston—on the ground that the nearness of Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and private electronics laboratories gave the best assurance of the Center's success, so they said. Thus far, there is little to indicate that thorough evaluation was given to potential locations distant from the Boston area.

Mr. President, two or three excellent sites were offered by communities in Ohio. Among these were very desirable locations in Columbus, Sandusky, Chillicothe, and the Crile Hospital site, at Parma, Ohio, a city of 100,000, a suburb of Cleveland, and the fastest growing community in our State. Frankly, I believe that no other site owned by the Federal Government is comparable to the Crile Hospital site, which has 324 acres of prime Government-owned and developed real estate. It is sound economy for the Federal Government to use its own land for new governmental facilities. Not only does this save taxpayers' money, but the Government also has the benefit of land use studies which were made at the time of the original acquisition.

In all respects, Cleveland eminently qualifies for this important new facility. It has two first-rate engineering schools—Case Institute of Technology and Penn College—Western Reserve University, Baldwin Wallace College, John Carroll University, and other outstanding institutions of higher learning. The famed College of Wooster, Hiram Col-

lege and Kent State University are not far away. In the area of private electronics research, Cleveland possesses one of the oldest and best developed facilities in the country—the Nela Park Research Center of the General Electric Co.—and a host of other private electronics enterprises, including the Thompson-Ramo Products Co.

Furthermore, the Lewis Flight Center, an important NASA facility, already is in a suburb of Cleveland. The Lewis Flight Center could provide staff and facilities to accelerate the operation perhaps a year or two ahead of schedule than if the electronic center were located elsewhere.

The proposed location to which I am advertising is only 12 miles from downtown Cleveland. It is ideally located for a facility of the kind proposed. The airport and the Lewis Flight Center are less than 15 minutes distant by automobile. It takes but 30 minutes or less to reach some of the finest educational institutions in the Nation. Comfortable and lovely residential areas surround the area making it attractive to the highly skilled scientists who will staff the research center.

(At this point Mr. BAYH took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, while it is certainly the desire of all Congressmen and Senators that this facility be located at a site which is in the best interests of our space program, it is evident that too much favoritism has been shown to two or three areas in the Nation in regard to space activities to the neglect of other areas, equally satisfactory or superior. Each time a new facility is proposed, we hear the same well-worn argument that it should go to an area which already has institutions with experience in this field. As a result a vicious cycle has formed, and it can almost be predicted that any new important space facility will go to Boston, Houston, or to California. Evidently, communities in the 47 other States of the Union are to be ignored and are not to take part in the space age.

Frankly, I am tired of the argument. I rise today to speak briefly in protest of what has been going on. When we meet with officials of NASA and talk on the subject, we are like supplicants in a matter that has already been decided before our arguments are heard and what we have to offer is made clear.

Furthermore, it is high time that new areas of the country share properly in Federal research and development plans. We have institutions of higher learning in Ohio which are of the top-most rank. I am not convinced that it is necessary that 10 of the Nation's 2,100 universities and colleges, with the University of California, MIT, and Columbia leading the list, should receive 40 percent of the \$900 million in Federal research funds awarded to higher educational institutions during the last fiscal year. To the contrary, I am convinced that it was wrong to do so. Federal officials insist that funds must go where the scientific talent is, but by consistently favoring a few universities, such as those to which I have referred,

either in California or in the Boston area, of course, talent will naturally flock to those universities. In my own mind I am certain that if Ohio State University, the University of Illinois, the University of Chicago, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Michigan, Purdue University, Indiana University, and other universities in the great State from whence the present Presiding Officer (Mr. BAYH in the chair) comes, or other outstanding institutions of higher learning in the Midwest, were to receive grants comparable to those awarded favored colleges in the Boston area and in California, within a year or two they could claim to have the so-called talent now making those colleges so attractive. They could claim to have much of that scientific talent that is now being spoken of when officials of NASA say that funds must be awarded in those certain areas to which I have adverted.

Mr. President, I fervently believe that now is the time to stop and investigate the entire program of the National Administration and Space Agency. I can assure Senators that NASA officials will have to set forth potent and very powerful arguments for locating the project at Boston, and to explain clearly and to advance logical reasons overwhelming in their clarity for locating in Boston, when other qualified sites, including Cleveland, were rejected. Shortly there will be testimony before the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, of which I am a member. I shall be on hand asking to be shown why this favoritism, as I look at it, has been perpetuated and why anything of that sort should be continued.

Between the east coast and the west coast there are 3,000 miles of America. Between Boston and California there are 180 million Americans. Unless there are real and compelling reasons for the decision to select Boston, the people who live in other areas of our Nation feel that they, too, have a right to share in the development of and in the benefits from space research and technology. We seek to have citizens in all areas of the 50 States of our Union contribute to the exploration of outer space and contribute to the supremacy and welfare of our country as they have the skill, the education, and the scientific talent to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to commend my colleague for speaking on the subject today. While he and I are from Ohio, I think the issue embraces a much larger territory than Ohio itself. The entire midwest part of our country is involved in a treatment accorded by the Federal Government that is gradually eroding the growth of the Midwest in favor of other areas throughout the country.

My colleague mentioned the fact that hearings were held by a committee of NASA to determine the place in the country to which the center should be assigned. I attended those meetings when

Ohio applicants presented their evidence, especially when Columbus and Cleveland did so. I wish frankly to state what while I was there espousing the cause of Cleveland and Cincinnati, I said to myself, "This is just vain talk. The decision has been made." These hearings are an instrumentality to give dignity to the choice of Boston. Subsequent developments rather effectively confirmed the judgment which I had at that time.

The Presiding Officer, Senator BAYH, is from Indiana. When I speak of the Midwest States, I include eight in that area—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The statistics and graphs of economic growth show that the trend in those States is downward. I suggest that a substantial cause for the erosion of the economy in the Midwest comes from this propensity upon the part of the central government not to assign to different areas of the country those operations which become the subjects of attracting new industry and retaining old.

The electronic research center is gone. It is assigned to Boston. That is where it was assigned in October of 1962, when the elections throughout the country were being held.

The committee which heard the different petitions was very courteous. It caused us to believe that if we would show what universities we had, what the environmental situation was, what the cultural situation was that there would be an effort to consider Ohio and one or two other States. That was just a facade. That is what it has proved to be.

May I say to my colleague that there is another project in the making, and that is the Environmental Health Center. That will be a huge project, in which research will be done with regard to abolishing noxious materials from the air and eliminating pollution from the water. The Lewis Research Center was the beginning of the research in the electronics field. As far as NASA is concerned, the Lewis Research Center is the beginning. The Lewis Research Center is located in Ohio. That factor was given no consideration.

With respect to the Environmental Health Center, in Cincinnati we have the beginning of that research work. It is done at what is known as the Taft Health Center in Cincinnati. With respect to the Environmental Health Center, it is rather obvious that the base of the operation will be located in Washington.

On that score, I wish to say something. We had better quite centralizing everything in Washington, not only the great power of spending money, not only the great power of telling people everywhere that Washington best knows what to do in the matter of social science, economics, political science, and culture.

That project will probably cost \$50 million. I cannot give the exact figure. It was intended for Washington. It will come to Washington, although we are again told, "Make your case. Present your evidence. Maybe you will have a chance."

On the idea of concentration, let me state that some day we will realize the

mistake of concentration, and especially of concentration in Washington. A stenographer cannot be hired here for less than \$6,500 a year, while stenographers throughout Ohio, Indiana, and other States are looking for jobs. Yet we keep expanding activities here when we know there is an inadequacy of personnel, and that because of that inadequacy, we are "paying through the nose."

I am not envious of the States that get certain assignments. I am, however, here to complain about the constant statement that is being made that the Midwestern States do not have the engineering and scientific know-how to do the job. If an examination is made of the number of engineers and scientists graduating from the midwestern colleges, it will be found that those universities and colleges are providing scientists for all the States enjoying Federal contracts.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the substitute amendment for the wheat and cotton farm bill.

Mr. STENNIS. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Who has the floor?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator from Mississippi, I secured permission to speak on a subject that was not germane to the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Who has the floor?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I have the floor. I was happy to yield to my colleague, as we concur about the serious situation now under discussion.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], who subsequently yielded for a brief statement by his colleague, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche].

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall conclude in a moment.

With all the domestic and international problems we have, I hope that we shall not develop in our country a new problem resulting from the fact that the Federal Government is not treating all of its children alike. If we ever adopt the philosophy that those in power, selected by all of the people of the country, can give preferential treatment to their own States at the expense of the others, I submit, Mr. President, that we shall be taking on a new task most difficult of solution.

I conclude by commending my colleague for discussing this subject today.

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] for the insertion of a morning business matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.